

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

The agrarian order of Tsarist Russia, as is well known, was distinguished by many feudal survivals, the most prominent of which were the enormous latifundia or landed estates. On these large estates, especially on those in the central regions of Russia, various forms of serf-slave tenantry, payment in kind, share-cropping, and "winter loans" (zimmiye nayemki) prevailed.

This agrarian relationship, which prevailed for the purpose of preserving the enormous hereditary landholdings, was one of the primary reasons for the economic backwardness of pre-Revolutionary Russia. Lenin has pointed out in his works that the holders of large landed estates were the mainstay of both the economic and the political backwardness of Russia.

Medieval servitude was intertwined with contemporary forms of capitalistic exploitation. Along with the slow and gradual capitalistic evolution of landed properties and their integration into a capitalistic system, processes of stratification in the peasantry were at work within the rural communities. The kulak appeared in the country and began the enslavement of the peasant-poor by utilizing debt-labor and other methods of capitalistic exploitation of the rural laborers; new class antagonisms emerged and developed within the communities. The landless peasantry marched on the road to inevitable destruction, ruin, and impoverishment.

Lenin has pointed out that 10 million peasant farms consisted of only 73 million desyatinas (one desyatina equals 2.7 acres) of land, while estates in the hands of 28,000 landowners comprised 70 million desyatinas. Another 70 million desyatinas of land were in the hands of peasant bourgeoisie and capitalistic landowners.

This was the basic economic background of the development of the peasants' struggle for land.

Thirty years ago, on the historic night of 7 November, the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets issued a land decree, according to which land ownership was immediately abolished without compensation. All land became government property and was given over to rural soviet (volost) and district soviet (uyezd) land committees for division among the peasants.

The socialist revolution completely destroyed all medieval relationships and liquidated the large landowner class. The peasantry was delivered from the exploitation of the estate system; it received free use of more than 150 million desyatinas of estate, government, and monastery land; and, it was relieved of tenantry payments amounting to about 500 million gold rubles per year.

With the destruction of the principle of land ownership, the greatest obstacle standing in the way of the development of the productive strength not only of the agricultural but of the whole domestic economy of the nation, was eliminated. The destruction of the principle of private land ownership smoothed the transition to socialism in agriculture; it liberated the peasant from servile attachment to his scrap of land and facilitated the transition from a small-scale peasant economy to a large-scale collective economy.

The Revolution dealt the capitalistic, kulak economy a heavy blow. By undermining the kulak and raising an appreciable portion of the poor to the level of the peasant of average means, the peasantry became leveled or equalized. The peasant of average means became the central figure in agricultural affairs. Up to the Revolution, according to the data of the TsSU (Central Statistical Administration), poor peasants accounted for 65 percent, middle peasants for 20 percent, and kulaks for 15 percent of the whole peasant population; by 1928, the proportion of middle peasants had been raised to 60 percent, the number of poor peasants reduced to 35 percent, and kulaks to 4-5 percent.

Before the Revolution, landed estates produced 600 million pud (one pud equals 36 pounds) of grain, the kulaks 1,900 million pud, and the poor and middle peasants 2,500 million pud. In 1926-1927, grain production by poor and middle

- 2 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

peasants had increased from 2.5 billion to 4.1 billion pud, that produced by kulaks had fallen to 0.17 million pud. These facts testify that the Revolution benefited poor and middle peasants greatly and undermined the economic strength of the kulak system.

However, small-scale agricultural production was unavoidably doomed. Agriculture, as it had existed up to that time, had become hopelessly obsolete, for a small-scale economy and private disposition of labor were incompatible with modern mechanical techniques and with scientific organization of labor and production.

Unorganized peasant labor was characterized by the use of primitive methods and consequent low productivity. Even in 1928, at the end of the reconstruction period, 10 percent of the plowing for summer crops was still done with wooden plows; three-quarters of the tilled plots were sown by hand, and more than half of the grain was harvested with sickles and scythes. Communal land tenure, with various families working separate and often distant plots, was the rule.

A natural result of low labor productivity was a relatively insignificant amount of surplus and, in turn, an insignificant rate of accumulation of surplus. For the period 1926-1928, the average annual increase in industrial production was 26 percent, but in agriculture, for the same period, it was only 2.6 percent. Even after conclusion of agricultural reform, surplus supplies did not increase because small-scale producers could not produce much more than they required for their own needs.

The small-scale peasant economy was thus characterized by low surplus production. Before the Revolution, 47 percent of grain marketed came from the landed estates, 34 percent from kulak holdings, and 19 percent from peasant lands. But in 1926-1927, after reform, the share of the peasantry was only 11 percent of grain marketed.

The presence of small-scale peasant producers in a production system does not unify but rather divides the system. In accordance with economic law, small-scale production is disrupted and gradually excluded by larger scale production growing up in its midst.

The Soviet Government actively intervened in the economic processes taking place in the country; it rendered all kinds of assistance to the poor, helping to raise them to the level of the middle peasants; and the party and the government carried out an energetic policy of limiting and repressing kulakism, i.e., the capitalist element in the country. But as long as private ownership of the means of production remained the economic foundation of the peasant economy, the natural and historic tendency of the peasantry was preserved.

During the transitional period from capitalism to socialism, when large-scale socialist industry in the city existed alongside small-scale peasant holdings in the country, the contradiction between the dual bases in the national economy of the USSR could not be resolved.

One base was the large-scale socialist industry, which was being developed in accordance with the principle of expanding production and which was growing from year to year. The other base was the small-scale peasant economy, which was not always capable even of maintaining normal production.

The industrialization of the country drew with each year an ever greater portion of the population into industry, and the city became ever more dependent on agricultural products and raw materials. The country with its small-scale production system was not able to satisfy this demand. Also, the continuing process of parceling out land to the peasants cut down on production still more and thereby added to the disparity between city demand and country supply.

- 3 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

One base, large-scale socialist industry, destroyed capitalist elements; the other, small-scale peasant agriculture, produced capitalist elements. However, Stalin has stated that as long as large-scale production has not been established in agriculture, as long as the small peasant holdings have not been united into large-scale collective farms, the danger of a restoration of capitalism in the USSR is the most real of all possible dangers.

The paradox of the two bases in the national economy of the USSR was to form the economic background against which the class struggle in the transitional period developed. The closer the capitalist elements were brought to utter destruction, the more furious and violent was their struggle.

The struggle of the party against the counterrevolutionary Trotskyite-Zinovyevite bloc and against the capitalistic rightists was the ideological expression of the class struggle in this period. The rightists' theory of laissez-faire (samoteka) regarding the liberation of petty-bourgeois elements and their encouragement of capitalist production tendencies, openly and unambiguously disclosed the interests and expectations of the capitalist elements; and these very same interests were served by rightist theories regarding the peaceful growth of capitalism into socialism and the harmony of class interests. The counterrevolutionary Trotskyite-Zinovyevite bloc fostered disbelief in the possibility of constructing a socialist society in our country, insisted on the incompatibility of the class interests of the proletariat and the peasantry, and maintained the impossibility of overcoming the capitalist mode of development in the country. All of these teachings in reality represented capitulation to capitalistic elements.

In the struggle with the Trotskyites, the rightists, and other enemies of the people, the party defended and carried into practice the Leninist-Stalinist Cooperative Plan.

The supreme organizing strength of the party and of the Soviet Government in socialist construction was demonstrated by just this, that the party and government were successful in turning the peasantry from the path of capitalist to that of socialist development. The socialist revolution in rural areas was characterized not by a natural growth of socialist forms, but by the establishment of kolkhozes and sovkhozes and by repression of petty-bourgeois elements with their inherent capitalist tendencies. These measures united the peasants on collective farms and created communal, collective holding of the means of production.

The singularity of this revolution lay in the fact that it was carried out from above, through the initiative of governmental power, with direct support from below, that is, from the masses of the peasantry. This revolution was carried through in the sharpest and most cruel of struggles with the kulaks, the perishing remnants of the capitalist class. The last roots of the capitalist production pattern were ripped up with the collectivization of agriculture and the liquidation of the kulaks as a class.

Lenin repeatedly spoke of the dual nature of the peasant. The peasant is a petty landholder, but at the very same time is an industrious worker, and in the latter fact lies the foundation for a rapprochement of the interests of the peasantry and of the proletariat and for the inclusion of the peasantry into the general course of socialist development through mass cooperation of the peasantry.

The capitalistic road of development of the country is the road to ruin and impoverishment for the overwhelming majority of the peasants. The capitalistic evolution of the peasantry in the West graphically testifies to this. The Industrial Revolution in England carried the small independent peasant to almost complete destruction; the mass expulsion of thousands of peasant families in the period of the famous Enclosure Movement was one of the most tragic moments in the initial growth of capitalism. The position of the small contemporary tenant-farmer is called "British Slavery" even by the English.

- 4 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

In the US the comparatively greater freedom from feudal survivals did not save the American farmer from deprivation of land and from ruin. Even in 1930, according to US census data, 60 percent of the US farmers possessed only 15.7 percent of farm land; the majority of the farmers are tenants or lease holders.

In Germany (1933 census), about a million peasants held less than 2 hectares of land, while the majority (51.1 percent), small and middle peasants holding up to 5 hectares, possessed only 13.9 percent of all agricultural land. These peasants were only seemingly independent. They were mired in mortgages, and the interest on their debts took an appreciable part of their income.

Marx had already written, at the beginning of the 1850's, about the French peasantry. Their holdings were only pretexts for capitalist exploitation. The peasants, therefore, in conflict with the bourgeoisie but unable to defend their own interests, thus became the natural allies of the city proletariat.

The peasants of the USSR, however, had been schooled in three revolutions against the Tsar and bourgeois rule. They had entered into an alliance with the proletariat and had received land and peace from the proletarian revolution. The peasantry, moreover, as Stalin has said, valued political friendship and collaboration with the proletariat and could not but constitute favorable material for economic collaboration.

Mass cooperation of the peasantry was the simplest and best way, acceptable to both the peasantry and the government, for guaranteeing the subordination of private to general interests and for drawing the peasantry into the task of socialist construction.

Initially, a cooperative market system prevailed, i.e., socialized markets buying agricultural products and socialized markets providing industrial goods for the peasants. This system was acceptable to the peasants because it permitted better market organization at less expense, and to the government, because it facilitated control of market elements and was the beginning of collectivism in the rural economy.

The industrialization of the country laid the material basis for the transition from cooperative marketing to cooperative production. More intimate ties were established between the industrial and agricultural segments of the economy.

Cooperatives, organized in the branches of agriculture, resulted from the ties between the industrial and agricultural economies. "Flax-center," a union of flax-producing peasants, was an example of new ties between the city and country. It supplied the peasants with seed and tools, bought up the whole harvest, placed it on the market on a mass basis, and guaranteed the sharing of the peasants in the profits. The cooperative thus connected the peasantry, through the Agricultural Union, with state industry.

State industry presented the prototype for contractual agreements. On a similar basis, agreements are concluded between agricultural cooperatives and industry. In return for set amounts of agricultural raw materials at previously fixed prices, industry issued credit to the collectives and supplied machines, fertilizer, etc.

The city organized and carried the rural areas along with it by spreading new socialist forms and relations, suppressing petty-bourgeois peasant elements, subordinating the rural economy to government control, and gradually bringing it into the general course of socialist construction.

The supreme culminating point in the development of Soviet agriculture, general collectivization in the country, was prepared by all prior developments in the Soviet system. These developments included (1) creation of a socialist industry, the key to the reconstruction of agriculture on a collective basis; (2) the development of a cooperative peasant economy, including the organization of

- 5 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

MTSs and sovkhoses; and (3), by attacking capitalistic elements, destruction of resistance to general collectivization of agriculture.

Great historical credit for developing and applying to real life the theory of agricultural collectivization is due to Stalin.

From the general Leninist views on the necessity of establishing large-scale socialist agricultural production, Stalin exhaustively developed the problem of the higher stages of the Leninist cooperative plan, the kolkhoz form of socialist agriculture.

Stalin found the primary pattern of kolkhoz construction for the contemporary era in the agricultural artel. Mass organization of artels was carried through in the period of general collectivization; the artel replaced simple association in the working of land, which had been the more primitive and dispersed form of kolkhoz prevailing prior to general collectivization.

The agricultural artel is the basic form of the kolkhoz in the present period, since it justly combines and adapts the personal, vital interests of the kolkhoz members with their commercial interests and facilitates the education of the peasant-kolkhoz members in the spirit of Communism.

The economic basis of the artel is communal, collective ownership. However, in the artel, only the more important means of production (work animals, agricultural machines, implements, etc.) are socialized; the kolkhoz members retain private, secondary holdings which yield them profits for satisfying their additional needs.

Stalin has stressed the inadmissibility of attempting to force socializing the masses, but rather the necessity of keeping in touch with them and carrying them along.

The Stalinist regulations for artels provide the basis of a just union between communal and private economy in the kolkhoz. However, remnants of the petty-ownership psychology still have not been eliminated from among the kolkhoz members and the possibility still exists of favoring private work over communal work. The party and the government repeatedly have directed resolutions against serious breaches of the artel regulations, against the expansion of private production, through which the personal holdings might evolve into a private small-holder system. Such resolutions included the decree of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR of 27 May 1939 titled "Measures for Preserving Communal Land Tenure of the Kolkhozes from Misappropriation" and the decree of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and the Central Committee of 19 September 1946 entitled "Measures for Elimination of Violations of the Model Regulations for Agricultural Artels."

The victory of socialism in agriculture by no means signifies that the kolkhoz movement may now be left to drift, that the further development of socialist relations is guaranteed by the very existence of kolkhozes. Stalin has stressed that during the transition period to collectivism, Communists must not reduce, but rather lighten, their solicitude for agriculture. Drifting is over a danger in the socialist development of agriculture.

The kolkhoz is one of the forms of socialist economy, but it is one of the less developed forms. The socialist cooperative union of yesterday was established primarily to maintain control over government-owned land and means of production and to insure their use under the direction of a socialist government.

Socialist reconstruction of agriculture revealed possibilities for the wide employment of machines on the land. A mechanical revolution followed the socialist revolution. The introduction of tractors and machines into agriculture, the most backward sector of the national economy in which the most archaic working methods were tenaciously adhered to, was a most revolutionary change in the working of yesterday's small holdings.

- 6 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

The utilization of machinery and the social and economic reforms in the rural areas. Through collectivization, individual labor became a technical necessity. When work has been mechanized, there is not and cannot be a reversion to an unorganized small-scale private economy.

Stalin has pointed out the significance of the MTS (Machine-Tractor Station) as a basic means in socialist reconstruction of agriculture and as a gift to agriculture and the peasantry from the socialist government. In order to strengthen the economic base of influence of the socialist government in the country, the government kept for itself the ownership of the most important means of production, the land and the machine-tractor parks.

During the Stalin Five-Year Plans, MTSs, which are government enterprises of an inherently socialist type and which control tractors, combines, and other complex machines, were established in all areas of general collectivization and took care of almost all kolkhoz operations.

In 1930, 158 MTSs possessed 7,100 tractors. In 1940, 7,069 MTSs controlled 683,000 tractors, 197,000 combines, and a great number of various kinds of non-automotive (trailer) machines.

At the end of the Second Five-Year Plan, the percentage of kolkhoz work performed by power equipment attained the following proportions: 75 percent of summer crop plowing, 50 percent of winter crop sowing, 65 percent of cotton planting, and 95 percent of sugar beet planting. Combines were used in 42 percent of all harvesting and in 90 percent of sunflower seed harvesting.

The degree of mechanization of sovkhoses is higher than on kolkhozes. The state-enterprise sovkhoses are the mechanized production centers of grain, technical crops, and other agricultural products. On the eve of war, Soviet agriculture had become the most mechanized rural economy in the world. Although there were fewer tractors than in the US, the volume of tractor work in the USSR was appreciably greater, thanks to more complete and better use of mechanical equipment.

The MTSs assisted in the organizational and economic strengthening of the kolkhozes; the MTS political sections did a great deal to create kolkhozes, to cleanse the kolkhozes of kulak elements, and to strengthen the communal aspects of the kolkhozes. The MTSs successfully combined the organizational leadership of the state with the independence of the peasant-kolkhoz members by re-educating yesterday's individualists into the spirit of collectivism.

One of the serious problems of kolkhoz construction is the creation of socialist labor discipline. In a speech before the First Congress of Soviets of the National Economy held in 1918, Lenin characterized the matter of labor discipline as a most difficult problem. He stated that the city working class learned discipline in the school of cooperative labor in industry. But, he stated, creating socialist discipline in the kolkhoz peasantry, unaccustomed as it is to any sort of collective effort, is a more difficult problem.

Increasing the participation of the kolkhoz members in collective labor and improving labor discipline were possible only on the basis of the kolkhoz member's personal material interest in the results of his labor in the communal establishment. Even before the war, the party and government took measures to provide additional pay for exceeding crop and livestock-raising plans in order to heighten the personal interest of the peasant in increased agricultural productivity. The abolition of irresponsibility, the organization of permanent work brigades, and the widest utilization of piecework payment all permit each kolkhoz member clearly to see and feel the results of his personal effort and to establish a connection between his personal participation in communal production and his personal share in the communal receipts.

The problems of the struggle with old survivals, the creation of conditions under which an idler is not able to hide behind hard-working kolkhoz members,

- 7 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

the promotion of labor discipline were all resolved in practice during the Stalin Five-Year Plans.

In his report on the results of the First Five-Year Plan in 1933, Stalin described the kolkhozes as still being weak economic organisms, experiencing approximately the same growing pains as our plants and factories in 1920-1921. However, in the less than 10-year period following, the kolkhoz system grew to such a degree that it had clearly demonstrated its tremendous advantages not only over a petty-marketing system but also over a capitalistic economy.

In 1940, 38,300,000 tons of grain (17,000,000 tons more than in 1913) and 2,700,000 tons of raw cotton (3½ times more than in 1913) were produced in the USSR.

By 1938, the USSR had moved into first place in world wheat production, for in 1937 she produced 31.1 percent of the world's wheat, 97 percent as much as the US, ten times more than Canada, and nine times more than Argentina. In rye, barley, and oats production, the USSR also ranked in first place.

The grain supply problem had not yet been solved in our country prior to all-round collectivization. The cities experienced grain shortages. The cotton industry was not being supplied with domestic cotton. These problems were completely resolved by general collectivization. Supplies were assured to the population, raw materials to industry. Besides, appreciable state reserves of grain, agricultural raw materials, and other agricultural products were created.

On the basis of wide utilization of machinery, socialist agriculture was able to attain a better mastery of the soil. During the First Five-Year Plan alone more than 21 million hectares were added to land under cultivation. This increase in itself exceeds all tilled land in Germany and almost equals that of France.

There has been an especially large increase in land used for technical crops. In 1940, land devoted to technical crops was 159 percent of that in 1913; land under vegetable, melon, and potato cultivation was 162 percent greater than in 1913; and land used for fodder crops was 9 times greater than in 1913.

Socialist agriculture penetrated into new regions, the Far North and the Far East. Wide, barren consuming areas were transformed into producing areas, wheat cultivation was undertaken further to the north than in the past.

Formerly unusable land--marshes and deserts--was made into tillable fields. More than 2 million hectares of marshes in Karelia, Leningrad Oblast, Belorussia, the northern Caucasus, and the Transcaucasus were drained for cultivation. In Central Asia, the Transcaucasus, and Kazakh SSR more than 420,000 kilometers of irrigation canals were built and more than 3 million hectares of desert were put under cultivation.

Yields increased in proportion to the increase in area sown. In 1909-1913 grain yield amounted to 7.4 centners per hectare, during the period 1933-1937 to 9.1 centners per hectare, and in 1938 to 9.7 centners per hectare.

Livestock multiplied rapidly on the kolkhozes. By 1940, the number of livestock farms had increased 78 percent over 1937. At the beginning of 1941 there were 261 livestock farms on 100 kolkhozes, consisting of 99 long-horned cattle farms, 91 sheep farms, and 71 hog farms.

In 1940, gross agricultural output was almost twice as great as in 1913.

Thus, socialist reform of agriculture has fundamentally changed the position of agriculture in relation to industry, of the country to the city. It has created the conditions for full elimination of the antagonisms and disparities between the city and country. Large-scale production in the rural areas now corresponds to

- 8 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

large-scale socialist production. The techniques of socialist agriculture are being developed along the very same basic lines as those of the large-scale machine industry. The mechanization of basic production processes, electrification, chemicalization, and industrialization of production are characteristic not only of industry, but increasingly of agriculture. Agricultural work is being transformed into a facsimile of industrial work.

The ratio of mechanical power to all motive power used in agriculture had attained 70 percent by 1938. By the end of the Second Five-Year Plan, power output of agricultural electric power stations was 115 times greater than the pre-Revolutionary level.

Rural electrification expanded greatly in the postwar period. In 1945 alone, 600 small rural hydroelectric power plants and 900 steam electric power plants using local fuel supplies were placed into operation. Agricultural consumers were tied into nets of the state power system to the extent of 38,800 kilowatts of generating capacity. Total power consumption by agricultural consumers at the end of the new Five-Year Plan will increase to 3.5 billion kilowatt-hours.

The revolution in agricultural techniques carried with it a cultural revolution. New industrial professions have grown up in the country, including such professions as mechanics, tractor operation, harvesting and threshing unit operation, etc. Labor qualifications are being raised sharply. There is now a much higher cultural and general literate level among the peasantry.

After 30 years of Soviet rule, illiteracy has been practically eliminated. General obligatory education of children has been brought about both in the city and country. The number of children attending primary, 7-year, and middle schools in villages exceeded 22 million in 1938-1939. In 1939, rural libraries numbered 61,700 and books 49.2 million.

The socialist revolution liberated the peasant woman and gave her political and economic equality. The institution of kolkhozes brought economic independence to the peasant woman, and she became an equal participant in collective labor. In 1937, 31.1 percent of all workdays on the kolkhozes were performed by women. During World War II this percentage rose much higher, because during the war women carried the great burden of all important work on the kolkhozes.

World War II interrupted peaceful kolkhoz construction. But in spite of the difficulties of war and enemy occupation of important agricultural regions, socialist agriculture successfully continued to provision the population and the Army and to supply raw materials to industry. This achievement demonstrated the advantages of large-scale socialist production in agriculture and the strength and vitality of the kolkhoz system.

After the war, the party and the government introduced a number of important measures for the restoration of agriculture. Considerable assistance in the way of tractors, agricultural machines, automatic machines, and draft and breeding livestock was given to kolkhozes in the liberated regions. The MTS net was re-established. Communal and kolkhoz structures are still being rebuilt. Already in 1946, the sown area in liberated regions attained three-quarters of the prewar level, and more than half the livestock on the kolkhozes and of the kolkhoz members had been replaced.

The February 1947 Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party set forth as the most urgent task the guarantee of such advance in agriculture as would permit, in the shortest time, the creation of an abundance of provisions for the population, of supplies for light industry, and of state reserves of provisions and raw materials.

The program for improvement of agriculture contemplates that grain production at the end of the Five-Year Plan should markedly surpass the prewar level, that

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

production of technical crops such as cotton, long-fibered flax, and sugar beets be re-established and increased by that time, that the prewar number of long-horned cattle, sheep, and goats be surpassed by the end of 1948, and that the number of swine exceed the prewar level by the end of 1949.

Strengthening of socialist agriculture is proceeding on the basis of further organizational and administrative strengthening of the kolkhozes. The economic basis for this organizational and administrative strengthening of the kolkhozes is further development of the principle of communal socialist ownership. To greatly expand the number of kolkhozes during the Five-Year Plan will demand a large amount of socialist accumulation. State investments alone in agriculture will attain 14.9 billion rubles, of which 8.8 billion rubles will be devoted to re-establishment and development of MTSs.

Capital investments of the kolkhozes themselves in the communal economy will amount to 38 billion rubles for the five-year period. In order to grasp the magnitude of this kolkhoz capital accumulation, it will suffice to remember that the value of all basic means of production held by kolkhozes at the end of the second Five-Year Plan was 17.1 billion rubles. The high rate of kolkhoz accumulation testifies to the significant quantity of production surplus and to the growth of communal labor productivity on the kolkhozes. Socialist agriculture is developing upon the principle of expanded production since, like industry, it saves from year to year. The growth of kolkhoz accumulations means also the growth of communal, socialist ownership, which is the economic base for communal management of kolkhozes and for raising the material and cultural level of the rural communities.

Organizational and administrative strengthening of the kolkhozes should lead to improvement of labor discipline among the kolkhoz members and to heightening their personal material interest in raising the productivity of communal, collective labor.

Personal material involvement is the most important factor in raising labor productivity. In order to do this, it is necessary first of all to strengthen the workday, the basic measure of participation by kolkhoz members in communal labor. The strengthening of the workday assumes an increase of its rating; the workday should become fully weighted in its natural and monetary expression. The saving of workdays is one of the ways of increasing the workday rating.

The workday is the measure not only of quantity but of quality of labor by the kolkhoz members. A new system of planning workdays in individual branches of agriculture and strict control of the expenditure of workdays in accordance with the plan for brigades will assist in heightening the significance of the workday, raising its value, and in transforming it into one of the important economic controls of the distribution of labor resources among the branches of work.

The MTSs, which occupy an important position for the organizational and administrative strengthening of the kolkhozes, are being better equipped technically and provided with advanced operating methods. In the current Five-Year Plan, agriculture is receiving 325,000 tractors and agricultural machines valued at 4,500 million rubles (1926-1927 valuation rates). Grain sowing will be 70 percent mechanized in 1950 compared with 59 percent in 1940; plowing will be 90 percent mechanized in 1950 compared with 71-82 percent in 1940.

The role of the MTS as a basic fixture of the socialist state is being invigorated. The February Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party proposed close adherence to the contracts which define the reciprocal obligations existing between an MTS and the kolkhozes which it services. In addition, controls are being strengthened by means of accounts kept by kolkhozes regarding MTS services received. Payments in kind were introduced to rouse the interest of the MTS in the harvest and thus to improve the quality of tractor work. Rates of pay then will depend on the amount of work performed and also on productivity of the fields serviced.

- 10 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

The system of payment of a guaranteed minimum and additional pay for exceeding the plan also has as its aim an increase of responsibility and personal material interest of the tractor operators in the quality of tractor work with a consequent increased productivity on the kolkhozes' services.

The February Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party paid close attention to the problem of distributing profits on the kolkhozes. In 1946, the USSR experienced a severe drought, which struck an extensive area. In 1947, with more favorable weather and better labor organization, the harvest exceeded that of 1946 by 58 percent. Under such conditions a just distribution of profits at the end of the agricultural year gains even more importance.

Distribution of profits on the kolkhozes should be carried out on the basis of work performed by the brigades, so that kolkhoz members who have worked more may receive higher pay and those who have worked less, lower pay.

Abolition of wage leveling in the distribution of profits and strengthening of the workday will raise the personal material interest of the peasants, which is the decisive economic stimulant for the advance of agriculture in the contemporary period.

The USSR has now entered a new historical period, the transition period from socialism to Communism. A gradual psychological change is taking place in the peasantry, a change which is transforming the peasant into a diligent builder of Communist society.

- E N D -

- 11 -

CONFIDENTIAL